

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

SUFFREN ANTOINE,

Petitioner,

Case No. 1:15-cv-848

v.

Honorable Paul L. Maloney

KYLE FORCE,

Respondent.

---

**OPINION**

This is a habeas corpus action brought by a state prisoner under 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Promptly after the filing of a petition for habeas corpus, the Court must undertake a preliminary review of the petition to determine whether “it plainly appears from the face of the petition and any exhibits annexed to it that the petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court.” Rule 4, RULES GOVERNING § 2254 CASES; *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2243. If so, the petition must be summarily dismissed. Rule 4; *see Allen v. Perini*, 424 F.2d 134, 141 (6th Cir. 1970) (district court has the duty to “screen out” petitions that lack merit on their face). A dismissal under Rule 4 includes those petitions which raise legally frivolous claims, as well as those containing factual allegations that are palpably incredible or false. *Carson v. Burke*, 178 F.3d 434, 436-37 (6th Cir. 1999). After undertaking the review required by Rule 4, the Court will dismiss the petition without prejudice for failure to exhaust available state-court remedies.

## Discussion

### I. Factual allegations

Petitioner Suffren Antoine presently is incarcerated at the Gus Harrison Correctional Facility. Petitioner pleaded nolo contendere in the Kent County Circuit Court to charges of attempted second-degree home invasion and resisting and obstructing a police officer. On August 30, 2011, he was sentenced to respective prison terms of one to five years and one to two years. At the time of his offense, Petitioner was on parole from two to fifteen year sentence for second-degree home invasion, imposed in 2006.

On a date not specified in the amended petition, Petitioner was released on parole. On April 23, 2014, Petitioner was arrested by his parole officer, Defendant Kyle Force, on a variety of probation violation charges: changing residence without permission; failure to report; and contacting a person with a restraint order. In May 2014, following a parole-revocation hearing, Petitioner was convicted of violating his probation and returned to prison.

Petitioner filed his original habeas application on or about August 18, 2015.

### II. Exhaustion of State Court Remedies

Before the Court may grant habeas relief to a state prisoner, the prisoner must exhaust remedies available in the state courts. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1); *O'Sullivan v. Boerckel*, 526 U.S. 838, 842 (1999). Exhaustion requires a petitioner to “fairly present” federal claims so that state courts have a “fair opportunity” to apply controlling legal principles to the facts bearing upon a petitioner’s constitutional claim. See *O'Sullivan*, 526 U.S. at 842; *Picard v. Connor*, 404 U.S. 270, 275-77 (1971), cited in *Duncan v. Henry*, 513 U.S. 364, 365 (1995), and *Anderson v. Harless*, 459 U.S. 4, 6 (1982). To fulfill

the exhaustion requirement, a petitioner must have fairly presented his federal claims to all levels of the state appellate system, including the state's highest court. *Duncan*, 513 U.S. at 365-66; *Wagner v. Smith*, 581 F.3d 410, 414 (6th Cir. 2009); *Hafley v. Sowders*, 902 F.2d 480, 483 (6th Cir. 1990). “[S]tate prisoners must give the state courts one full opportunity to resolve any constitutional issues by invoking one complete round of the State’s established appellate review process.” *O’Sullivan*, 526 U.S. at 845. The district court can and must raise the exhaustion issue *sua sponte* when it clearly appears that habeas claims have not been presented to the state courts. *See Prather v. Rees*, 822 F.2d 1418, 1422 (6th Cir. 1987); *Allen*, 424 F.2d at 138-39.

The exhaustion requirement applies to claims challenging the revocation of parole. *See Sneed v. Donahue*, 993 F.2d 1239, 1241 (6th Cir. 1993) (noting that petitioner had exhausted all state remedies before bringing habeas action challenging the revocation of his parole); *Brewer v. Dahlberg*, 942 F.2d 328, 337 (6th Cir. 1991) (dismissing challenge to state parole revocation because state remedies were arguably available). Petitioner bears the burden of showing exhaustion. *See Rust v. Zent*, 17 F.3d 155, 160 (6th Cir. 1994). Moreover, when it is uncertain whether the Michigan courts will consider the petitioner’s habeas claims on the merits, this Court will presume that such state relief is available to the petitioner. *Hannah v. Conley*, 49 F.3d 1193, 1196 (6th Cir. 1995); *Brewer v. Dahlberg*, 942 F.2d 328, 340 (6th Cir. 1991). The state courts should have a full and fair opportunity to cure any constitutional infirmities in petitioner’s conviction. *See Brewer*, 942 F.2d at 340. “[A] state may not be considered to have waived the defense of nonexhaustion unless it does so expressly and through counsel.” *Rockwell v. Yukins*, 217 F.3d 421, 423-24 (6th Cir. 2000).

Parole revocations are subject to direct review under Michigan's Administrative Procedures Act, Mich. Comp. Laws § 24.304(1). *See Penn v. Dep't of Corr.*, 100 Mich. App. 532, 298 N.W.2d 756, 757–58 (Mich. Ct. App. 1980) (noting that the MDOC is an agency for purposes of the Administrative Procedures Act and that a parole revocation proceeding is a contested case that triggers application of the Administrative Procedures Act); *Witzke v. Withrow*, 702 F. Supp. 1338, 1348-49 (W.D. Mich. 1988). Under the Administrative Procedures Act, a prisoner may file a petition in circuit court to appeal a final decision of the parole board within sixty days after the date of mailing notice of the agency's final decision. *See MICH. COMP. LAWS § 24.304(1)*. Petitioner does not allege that he sought review under the APA within sixty days of the parole board's decision. Because time for seeking review has now expired, the APA no longer is available to Petitioner.

A prisoner also may attack the decision to revoke his parole by filing a state petition for habeas corpus relief. *See Morales v. Mich. Parole Bd.*, 676 N.W.2d 221, 230 (Mich. Ct. App. 2003); *Hinton v. Mich. Parole Bd.*, 383 N.W.2d 626, 629–30 (Mich. Ct. App. 1986); *Triplett v. Deputy Warden*, 371 N.W.2d 862, 865 (Mich. Ct. App. 1985); *see also Caley v. Hudson*, 759 F. Supp. 378, 381 (E.D. Mich. 1991) (dismissing federal habeas corpus petition by a state prisoner for lack of exhaustion of his available state habeas corpus remedy to challenge the revocation of his parole). A prisoner may, at any time, file a state writ of habeas corpus to challenge the revocation of his parole as long as the prisoner will be in custody at the time the judgment becomes effective. *See Triplett*, 371 N.W.2d at 865. Petitioner does not allege or show that he filed a state-court habeas petition in the Kent County Circuit Court, much less that he sought further habeas review in the Michigan Court of Appeals and the Michigan Supreme

Court. Because Petitioner has an available procedure to raise his claims in the state appellate courts, he fails to satisfy the exhaustion requirement. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(c).

III. Motion to Appoint Counsel

Petitioner has requested a court-appointed attorney. Indigent habeas petitioners have no constitutional right to a court-appointed attorney. *Johnson v. Avery*, 393 U.S. 483, 488 (1969); *Barker v. Ohio*, 330 F.2d 594, 594-95 (6th Cir. 1964); *see also Lovado v. Keohane*, 992 F.2d 601, 604-05 (6th Cir. 1993). The Court is required by rule to appoint an attorney only if an evidentiary hearing is necessary or if the interest of justice so requires. Rule 8(c), RULES GOVERNING SECTION 2254 CASES. In light of the Court’s determination that Petitioner’s federal habeas claims are unexhausted, Petitioner’s request for appointment of counsel is moot.

**Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, the Court will dismiss the petition for failure to exhaust available state-court remedies.

**Certificate of Appealability**

Under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), the Court must determine whether a certificate of appealability should be granted. A certificate should issue if Petitioner has demonstrated a “substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). This Court’s dismissal of Petitioner’s action under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases is a determination that the habeas action, on its face, lacks sufficient merit to warrant service. It would be highly unlikely for this Court to grant a certificate, thus indicating to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals that an issue merits review, when the Court already has determined that the action is so lacking in merit that service is not warranted. *See Love v. Butler*, 952 F.2d 10 (1st Cir. 1991) (it is “somewhat anomalous” for the court to summarily

dismiss under Rule 4 and grant a certificate); *Hendricks v. Vasquez*, 908 F.2d 490 (9th Cir. 1990) (requiring reversal where court summarily dismissed under Rule 4 but granted certificate); *Dory v. Comm'r of Corr.*, 865 F.2d 44, 46 (2d Cir. 1989) (it was “intrinsically contradictory” to grant a certificate when habeas action does not warrant service under Rule 4); *Williams v. Kullman*, 722 F.2d 1048, 1050 n.1 (2d Cir. 1983) (issuing certificate would be inconsistent with a summary dismissal).

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has disapproved the issuance of blanket denials of a certificate of appealability. *Murphy v. Ohio*, 263 F.3d 466 (6th Cir. 2001). Rather, the district court must “engage in a reasoned assessment of each claim” to determine whether a certificate is warranted. *Id.* at 467. Each issue must be considered under the standards set forth by the Supreme Court in *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473 (2000). *Murphy*, 263 F.3d at 467. Consequently, this Court has examined each of Petitioner’s claims under the *Slack* standard.

This Court denied Petitioner’s application on the procedural ground of lack of exhaustion. Under *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484, when a habeas petition is denied on procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability may issue only “when the prisoner shows, at least, [1] that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and [2] that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.” Both showings must be made to warrant the grant of a certificate. *Id.* The Court finds that reasonable jurists could not debate that this Court correctly dismissed the petition on the procedural ground of lack of exhaustion. “Where a plain procedural bar is present and the district court is correct to invoke it to dispose of the case, a reasonable jurist could not conclude either that the district court erred in dismissing the

petition or that the petitioner should be allowed to proceed further.” *Id.* Therefore, the Court denies Petitioner a certificate of appealability.

A Judgment consistent with this Opinion will be entered.

Dated: November 4, 2015

/s/Paul L. Maloney

Paul L. Maloney  
United States District Judge